FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

WEEKLY ORGAN OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

JANUARY 23, 1915

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
JAN 24 1915
PERIODICAL DIVISION

Drawn by
Nina E. Allender

Great Statues of History

Vol. III January 23, 1915 No. 4

The Suffragist

Weekly Organ of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

1420 F STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Domestic $1.00
Foreign $1.50
Single Copies .....5 cents

Checks, drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer of the Congressional Union

Columbian Printing Co., Inc., Washington
35

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under act of March 8, 1879

News of the Week

The Situation in Congress

SUFFRAGISTS have concentrated during the past week in calling on their Senators preparatory to the vote in the Senate on the national suffrage amendment which Senator Bristow has announced will probably be taken some time in the near future, in the intervals between different appropriation bills.

Backing Up the Amendment Through the Country

THE Congressional Union has inaugurated an active campaign throughout the country to bring pressure to bear on those members of the United States Senate who were absent when the vote was taken last year or were opposed to the amendment, so that no stone may be left unturned in an effort to secure the passage of the amendment if the vote is taken before the adjournment of Congress in March.

Mrs. Minnie E. Brooke, a North Carolina woman, left this week for the South and will hold meetings in the large cities of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana and Tennessee, in order to arouse sentiment in these Southern states, the stronghold of the opposition to the national amendment. Miss Margaret Fay Whittemore, who conducted the pre-election campaign in the State of Washington, is organizing meetings in Michigan to demonstrate to the two Michigan Senators who were absent last year at the time of the vote, the strong interest among their constituents in the pending amendment. Mrs. Edna S. Latimer, who conducted the Kansas election campaign for the Congressional Union, has started a vigorous campaign in Delaware and vicinity for the benefit of Senators Saulsbury and Dupont, both of whom opposed the national amendment at the time of the vote last year. Miss Doris Stevens has opened Congressional Union headquarters in New York and is planning a series of meetings to show Senators Root and O'Gorman, who were also against the amendment at the time of the previous vote, the strong sentiment existing in New York for the Federal bill.

The Protest by the Men's League

THE mass meeting called by the Men's League for Woman Suffrage of the District of Columbia to protest against the attitude of the House of Representatives toward the suffrage question was held on Saturday, January 16th, at 8 o'clock. Mr. Gilson Gardner, Vice-President of the League, presided in the absence from the city of the President, Dr. Harvey W. Wiley. The speakers were, Mr. William Hard, associate editor of *Everybody's Magazine,* Mr. Charles Edward Russell, the well-known writer, and Representative James W. Bryan, of Washington State. The following resolutions were unanimously passed by the meeting:

"Whereas, An insulting attitude toward women was shown by certain members of the House of Representatives during the debate on the woman suffrage amendment on January 12, and

"Whereas, the Men's League for Woman Suffrage of the District of Columbia considers that this incident was of such fundamental importance to the cause of woman suffrage that it should not go unchallenged, therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that a protest should be made against the insulting character of the said debate, and be it

"Resolved, Further: That the attached statement, setting forth the situation, should be sent to the several woman suffrage organizations in the District of Columbia, and that they be urged to call it to the attention of women generally."

The Men's League has issued a statement dealing particularly with the speech by Mr. Bowdle, of Ohio, during the course of the suffrage debate and with the appreciative attitude shown by the House in reception of his insulting remarks toward womanhood.

"An incident occurred in the House of Representatives during the debate upon woman suffrage on January 15, 1915, which went to the root of the woman suffrage question," says this statement. In referring to the vociferous laughter and applause which greeted Mr. Bowdle's remarks, the statement continues:

"The men who laughed were not bad men; they were average men. Every man knows this, though few women know it. It is the commonplace attitude of the street, the bar room, the logging camp, the smoking car, the club and the college mess hall.

"American manhood could not be more truly typified probably than it was by this gathering of chosen representatives from all corners of our land. It is said with truth that a civilization is tested by the attitude of its men toward its women; and the incident of this historic day of the American Congress—a genuine burst of average male sentiment—marks the point where we now stand on the long uphill road toward a different standard of civilization.

"The attitude of these representatives of men expressed no ill will toward women. It was the spontaneous result of a social condition—one left over from what we patronizingly call 'savagery.' Women are still the property and the playthings of men. Such is the blunt truth. Man has protected woman when it has been to his property interest to do so; otherwise he has not. Chivalry and white slavery have gone hand in hand. Fortunately a goodly portion of women are at last awakened to the need of doing their own defending. The virile movement for Woman Suffrage is one simply for self-protection. Society needs not charity, nor woman chivalry—except that kind that protects her in her fight to protect herself."

A telegram was read from Mr. Keefer, of the Ohio Men's League for Woman Suffrage, as follows:

"Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, President Men's League for Woman Suffrage, D. C.

"As a member of the Executive Committee Hamilton County Men's League for Woman Suffrage, I send you greetings and hope your protest against the latest of Mr. Bowdle's clownish antics will be so forcibly expressed that self-respecting men and women, though they be not in agreement with us as to suffrage, will uphold your action. People of refinement cannot dispose of Bowdle's speech by saying that it was peurile, but must say it is an offense to all womankind as women and as human beings. Whether Americans have as yet realized that the welfare of womanhood, childhood and all humanity can be better conserved through equal suffrage and women are a force for progress and human betterment need not at this time be discussed, but it is important that a vociferous protest be made against what must be characterized as nothing less than indecent and vulgar.

(Signed) DANIEL KEEFER."

Word comes into headquarters from all over the country that the speech of Bowdle, "the foul-mouthed," as Charles Edward Russell styled him, and the hilarious reception which it received from those same anti-suffragist southern Congressmen who based their denial of justice to women on the ground of their chivalrous attitude toward them have done more to win converts from the anti-suffrage ranks than anything since the mobbing of the March, 1913, parade by the anti-suffragists.

Bowdlism has crept into the vernacular as Cannonism did, and the Honorable Mr. Bowdle of Cincinnati, Ohio, seems destined to go down in history along with Captain Boycott and Speaker Cannon as the personification of a new evil in the body politic.

Captain Hobson of Alabama has announced that immediately upon Representative Bowdle's return to the Capital, he will present to the House the protest against Mr. Bowdle's speech and the reception accorded to it by members of the House, as sent to him by the Men's League for Woman Suffrage of the District of Columbia, and Men's Leagues from other parts of the country.

Information has been received that all mention of the hissing which ran through the galleries at the time of Representative Bowdle's speech was expunged from the Congressional Record at Mr. Bowdle's explicit request.

Woman's Legislative Congress of Illinois

THE Woman's Legislative Congress of Illinois, called at the suggestion of Lieutenant-Governor O'Hara to draw up suggestions for legislation, has decided to become a permanent organization. At the first meeting seven hundred dollars was contributed for printing a million copies of the recommendations by the Congress to be distributed through the State. Money was also appropriated to maintain a lobby at the legislature. Officers were elected as follows: Mrs. Harriet Taylor Treadwell, Chairman; Mrs. Ida L. M. Fursman and Mrs. Harlan Ward Cooley, first and second vice-chairman, and Mrs. Helen Hefferman, secretary-treasurer.

Vigorous Suffrage Activity in Texas

MISS HELEN TODD has undertaken a "Suffrage Survey" in Texas and the immediate result of her going to the State has been a great increase in the vigor of the suffrage campaign. The women of Texas are circulating petitions for the submission of a constitutional amendment enfranchising women. Headquarters have been opened in Galveston, and a thorough canvass has been undertaken in the large cities of the State.

The Governor of West Virginia Recommends Suffrage

GOVERNOR HATFIELD, of West Virginia, in his message to the State Legislature of West Virginia on January 13th, urged the passage of a bill providing for the submission to a referendum of the men voters of the State of the question of amending the State Constitution to enfranchise women.

A Correction

THE analysis according to parties of the recent vote in the House was incorrectly stated in the last paragraph on Page 5, of last week's issue of the Suffragist. The correct figures were given on Page 4 of the same issue.

"AND SO THE RESOLUTION WAS REJECTED"

THE victory won for suffrage in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 12, when the Mondell resolution was lost by a vote of 204-174, is the more apparent when the character of the opposition to the measure is remembered and considered in detail.

Never before has a suffrage resolution encountered not only the enmity of those forces which always have been and in some measure always will be opposed to this just reform, but also the President of the United States and the leaders of the majority party in Congress solidly arrayed against it.

The passage in the near future of the proposed constitutional amendment, which when ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures will place on a political equality with men the women of the United States, was assured when 174 votes were cast for the measure, 86 of them by Democratic members of the House, in face of opposition such as this:

UNTIL the party as such has considered a matter of this very supreme importance, and taken its position, I am not at liberty to speak for it; and yet I am not at liberty to speak for it as an individual, for I am not an individual."

(*President Wilson to the Working Women's deputation, which on February 2, 1914, asked him to give his support to the national suffrage amendment.*)

RESOLVED, That it is the sense of this caucus that the question of suffrage is a state and not a federal question."

(*This resolution was adopted by a vote of 124 to 56 upon motion of Representative Heflin of Alabama, at the Democratic caucus called February 3rd, 1914, to consider the question of a woman suffrage committee in the House of Representatives.*)

I NOT only said I was opposed to it (the suffrage resolution) but I said the party on this side of the chamber was opposed to it; and the party that has control of the legislation in Congress certainly has the right openly and above board to say that it will not support a measure that is not in accordance with its principles. * * * The Democratic party took its position last night, when by a two-thirds vote it fixed our position on that matter."

(*Representative Underwood of Alabama, Democratic floor leader, speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives February 4, 1914.*)

SUCH a change (a suffrage amendment to the constitution) would, I think, be running too fast and too far ahead of the general public sentiment of the country."

(*President Wilson in a letter to Miss Mary M. Childs, Dec., 1914.*)

THAT is the way I believe suffrage should come —by States. I can see no other way for woman suffrage to come through the Democratic party than through State action until thirty-six States, a three-fourths majority, are won, when the constitutional amendment can be forced.

(*President Wilson to Miss Anne Martin, President Nevada Equal Franchise Society, December 10, 1914.*)

I SHALL vote against it and so will most of the Democrats in the House. The party, by caucus action, has gone on record holding that woman suffrage, like prohibition, is a State issue and not a national question. It is a question for the States themselves to act upon, and not for Congress."

(*Representative Underwood, Democratic floor leader, in an interview on the approaching vote in the House, published in The Washington Post, December 25, 1914.*)

I WOULD be without excuse to my own constitutional principles if I lent my support to this very important movement for an amendment to the constitution of the United States."

(*President Wilson to deputation of Democratic women, who asked him to support the suffrage amendment, January 6, 1915.*)

IF any group of men should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic team for any purpose or from any motive, theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them."

(*President Wilson at Indianapolis, January 8, 1915.*)

Mrs. Beard, in New York Times (January 13), on Government by Caucus

AS there are men and women who are inclined to dispute, from time to time, the thesis of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage that we do have party government in this country, I should like to call the attention of your readers to the vote on the national suffrage amendment last Tuesday in the House of Representatives. That vote clearly and forcibly proves the thesis to be sound.

Taking the speeches alone that were made during the debate, one finds the Democratic leader, Mr. Underwood, and the Republican leader, Mr. Mann, each assuming a party attitude toward the question and that quite frankly. Mr. Henry, of the Rules Committee did the same thing. The most significant detail, however, in the evidence for party government was the statement made by Mr. Underwood about two weeks before the vote came before the House. That statement was printed in your paper. In it Mr. Underwood said that the Democratic Party had decided in its caucus (last Spring) that the national suffrage amendment should be defeated and he therefore forecast the vote of his party which was taken last Tuesday on the floor. Of course the Democratic Party allowed many of its members to vote for the measure—just as many as it could allow to insure the defeat of the amendment. Party action in the caucus, however, completely dominated that vote, and the fact was boldly admitted by the leader of the party.

One may ask why it is that a little caucus and a party boss or bosses can control an open vote to such an extent. The answer is that rebellious members of the party can be easily penalized through the control which the party leaders have over appointments on committees, advancement in power and influence, and over patronage. The majority of the members of the House are disfranchised by the power of the minority. They are not free voters, and the House is not a deliberative assembly, casting a vote in harmony with personal convictions or with the wishes of constituents.

The attitude of the Republicans under the leadership of Mr. Mann is an evidence of the recognition by that party that suffrage is at last a matter of practical national politics. Any personal sympathy with the question is tremendously strengthened by the knowledge that the Democrats, as a party, stood ready to defeat the question.

One who merely analyzes the vote of last Tuesday as so many Democrats for and so many Republicans for and draws therefrom an inference of dual responsibility for the defeat or progress of the national suffrage amendment is a very superficial observer of American government. One must go back of that vote to the caucus of the Democratic Party and to the position assumed by the real leader of the Democratic Party in Congress, namely, the President of the United States. Our measure was defeated by the Democratic caucus, which is the Government of the United States at the present time.

MARY BEARD.

Reasons for Opposing the National Woman Suffrage Amendment

Brought Forward by Members of the House of Representatives, United States Congress, in Debate on Tuesday, January 12, 1915.

1—That woman suffrage cannot be supported because of a man's "respect, admiration and reverence for womanhood."

2—That five little colored girls marched in a suffrage parade in Columbus, Ohio.

3—That women must be protected against themselves. They think they want to vote. As a matter of fact they do not want to vote, and man, being aware of this fact, is obliged to prevent them from getting the ballot that they do not want.

4—That the ballot would degrade women.

5—That no man would care to marry a suffragist.

6—That women do not read newspapers on street cars.

7—That women do not buy newspapers of Ikey Oppenstein, who keeps the stand on the corner.

8—That no man would care to marry a female butcher.

9—That no man would care to marry a female policeman.

10—That woman suffrage is a matter for the states to determine.

11—That Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch once marched in a procession in which was carried a banner inscribed "One Million Socialists Vote and Work for Suffrage."

12—That Inez Milholland married a Belgian and once referred to a cabinet officer as a joke.

13—That women fail to take part in the "duty of organized murder" and might therefore vote against war.

(Taken from the *Congressional Record* for Tuesday, January 14, 1915, page 1475.)

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Donald Hooker, Md., Chairman Finance
Mrs. Mary Beard, N. Y.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Cal.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr., Pa.

Mrs. Harriott Stanton Blatch, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Edward N. Breitung, N. Y.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. Winston Churchill, N. H.
Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin, Cal.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.
Mrs. John Dewey, N. Y.
Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon, Md.
Miss Lavinia Dock, N. Y.
Mrs. Abigail Scott Dunniway, Oregon

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Glendower Evans, Mass.
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Gilmore, Cal.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Miss Ada L. James, Wis.
Miss Helen Keller, Mass.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. William Bross Lloyd, Ill.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.

Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Mrs. Mary Hutcheson Page, Mass.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Annie Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. William Prendergast, N. Y.
Mrs. John Rogers, N. Y.
Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelsen, Ore.
Mrs. Thomas F. Walsh, D. C.
Mrs. Mina Van Winkle, N. J.
Mrs. John Jay White, D. C.
Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, Cal.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.

National Headquarters—1420 F Street, Washington, D. C.

COLORS—PURPLE, WHITE AND GOLD

Senate Resolution 130, and House Resolution 1

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (*two-thirds of each House concurring therein*), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE .—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Introduced:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon.
In the House: April 7, 1913, by Representative Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming.

Referred:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, to the Woman Suffrage Committee.
In the House: April 7, 1913, to the Judiciary Committee.

Reported:

In the Senate: June 13, 1913, favorable report.
In the House: May 5, 1914. Reported without recommendation.

Discussed:

In the Senate: July 31, 1913, twenty-two Senators in favor, three opposing.
September 18, 1913, Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, demanded immediate action.
On January 21, 1914, Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, delivered a speech urging the passage of the Amendment.
Made unfinished business, March 2, 1914.
Debated almost continuously from March 2d to March 19th.

Voted Upon:

In the Senate: March 19, 1914, thirty-five Senators in favor, thirty-four opposed, failing by eleven of the necessary two-thirds vote.
In the House: January 12, 1915, 174 in favor, 204 opposed; failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

Reintroduced:

In the Senate: March 20, 1914, by Senator Bristow, of Kansas.

Reported:

In the Senate: April 7, 1914, favorable report

Present Status:

In the Senate: On Calendar of Senate.

A LESSON FROM THE VOTE

WORKERS for the national suffrage amendment have contended that if money and energy were concentrated on that amendment it would mean its speedy passage. They have deplored the dissipation of forces in a large number of state campaigns, where such campaigns offered little hope of success. The debate and the vote in the House last week furnished convincing argument moreover that state campaigns which seem doomed to defeat are not only a waste of effort and funds but are a positive detriment to ultimate success by making it more difficult to pass the federal amendment. Men whose vote for the national amendment had been considered absolutely certain, voted against it last week on the ground that their states had given a verdict on the subject last November and that they could represent their constituents only by voting according to the stand these constituents had taken at the polls.

Suffrage lost in November in five states: Nebraska, Ohio, Missouri, North and South Dakota. From Nebraska only one out of the six members voted "aye." From Missouri 11 out of 15 voted "aye." From Ohio only 5 men out of 19 voted "aye." From North Dakota all three members voted "aye." From South Dakota 2 out of 3 Representatives voted "aye."

Of the above states, North Dakota can hardly be counted with the others because of the requirement in that state that a referendum must carry by a majority of the votes cast at the election and not a majority of the votes cast on the amendment. The fact that the amendment will be submitted under different conditions next year means that the matter is still pending in that state.

Of the 43 votes coming from these four campaign states, excluding North Dakota, only 19 were "aye"; or, including North Dakota, of the 46 votes from the five states only 22 were "aye"; in each case less than half. Prior to the election last November a large proportion of favorable votes from these states had seemed absolutely certain. Members of the House, not only in private interviews with suffragists, but in debate on the floor, stated again and again that they felt they could not oppose the verdict given by their constituents. Said Mr. Gordon, of Ohio, for instance:

"The people of my State rejected woman suffrage by 182,000 last fall. Do you think that they are demanding that we force it upon them by Federal act?"

Mr. Sloan, of Nebraska, made the same point in reference to his state:

"While unwarranted obstacles should not be placed in the way of amending our National Constitution," he said, "we must recall the fact that the unit for amending the Constitution is the State itself, and where the State itself, through its recognized system of expression, has recently published at the polls its sentiment upon that subject, that should be controlling upon the Representatives of the State. Especially is this true where a Member of Congress representing a district of the State finds the people whom he is elected to represent so emphatically speaking upon the question involved.

"If no recent deliverance had been made by the people of the State or my district on the subject, my course would be largely governed by whether or not, in my judgment, a very large percentage of the people of the district and State desired a right to express themselves on the subject; but in this their expression is not a matter of estimate but one of established fact. I feel it would not be my duty to vote to submit the question to the 48 States, which would give 36 States an opportunity to force upon my own State a measure which it has so recently rejected.

"Controlled by these considerations, I shall vote against the pending resolution."

Mr. Stafford, of Wisconsin, brought up the same argument.

"In Wisconsin," said Mr. Stafford, "we have had woman suffrage submitted to a vote of the people. Only 14 out of 71 counties registered their approval of it. Fifty-seven had clear majorities, many of them twice and a few three times as many against it. A total majority of more than 70,000 against it. There is no objection to Illinois saying that they should have woman suffrage, and if perchance Wisconsin or any other State through its men and women are opposed to having woman suffrage, why impose it upon us who believe it is not well for the polity of the State to extend the franchise?"

Mr. Carter, of Oklahoma, also presented this argument:

"The State of Oklahoma has gone on record," he said, "against woman suffrage by a State-wide vote of nearly two to one, and until the ladies of my home State give some adverse expression I shall certainly consider this action as binding instructions on me."

And even Mr. Lenroot, a strong believer in woman suffrage and a believer in the national amendment, voted against it on the ground, as he said, that

"At the last election it was submitted in seven States and defeated in five States. What are we to gather from that action? That there is a well-settled public demand for an amendment to the Federal Constitution in this respect? I ask you, sir, is not such public opinion as has been expressed directly to the contrary?

"I am sorry that that condition prevails," he said, "because I believe in woman suffrage."

Private letters and personal interviews bring the same testimony. Representative Brown, of Wisconsin, for instance, who voted against the measure, wrote in a letter to one of his constituents who had asked him to vote for the amendment:

"On equal suffrage Wisconsin has expressed itself as being overwhelmingly against it. Under these circumstances, I do not feel that a member of Congress, no matter what his personal views may be, has the right to make it possible for the other States to force woman suffrage upon Wisconsin."

Some of these Representatives would have voted against suffrage even had there been no referendum in their State on the subject. It makes us pause, however, when we see votes which have been pledged in support of the amendment turned against it by the defeat of suffrage in a State referendum. It forces us to realize the mistake of undertaking referendums in States where it is generally believed that such referendums can have only unsuccessful conclusions. Not only do such campaigns dissipate strength, but, as this debate and vote has indicated, they erect further barriers against the passage of the national amendment.

The States' Rights Argument in the Suffrage Debate

A REVIEW of the recent suffrage debate in the House shows that only one argument against the proposed amendment was brought forth with any seriousness. This was the doctrine of States' rights. Ten of those who opposed the amendment called the States' rights doctrine to their aid in speeches on the floor of the House. Six members, on the other hand, took the floor against the States' rights objection.

Those who supported the States Rights position were Representatives Henry of Texas, (Democrat); Dies of Texas, (Democrat); Stafford of Wisconsin, (Republican); Abercrombie of Alabama, (Democrat); Bartlett of Georgia, (Democrat); Sisson of Mississippi, (Democrat); Hughes of Georgia, (Democrat); Carter of Oklahoma, (Democrat); Mulkey of Alabama, (Democrat); and Lazaro of Louisiana, (Democrat).

Representative Hobson, of Alabama, (Democrat), who had been sponsor for the national prohibition amendment, vigorously decried State rights opposition to suffrage as well as to prohibition.

"Mr. Speaker, he said, "In my remarks on the merit of the rule I ventured to refer to the rights of the States and point out what I wish to review, that the proposed resolution does not interfere with those rights. It does not impose anything upon the States. It simply permits the sisterhood of States to put certain limitations both upon the Federal Government and upon themselves, and three-quarters of the sisterhood of States have an inherent fundamental right to that thing. To deny them this opportunity is to deny them the most vital of all their reserved rights.

"Let me remind my colleagues, particularly those from the South, that this prescription of the qualifications of the franchise applies only to the question of sex. It does not inject any new problem into the franchise problems of the States; it does not complicate any existing problem in the franchise problems of the State. It is a complete fallacy to contend that the question of sex, the inhibition of discrimination on account of sex, would involve the race question in politics or any other complication. The sisterhood of States would leave individual States in full control of questions of the franchise, subject only to the provision that whatever the qualifications are that a State may prescribe citizens of the United States and citizens of that State shall not be discriminated against because of sex."

And later in the debate he continued:

"The brotherhood of States is the repository of the organic law. The most vital right the States possess and cherish is the power to amend the organic law of the Nation. Congress, in withholding the opportunity to exercise this right, would violate this the most fundamental right of the States. Let no Member invoke State rights, let no Member invoke the police power of the States, when he deprives the brotherhood of States of the opportunity to amend the Constitution and determine themselves the question of equal suffrage."

Mr. Sims of Tennessee, another Democrat, replied to the State rights opposition.

"Why did the Committee on Rules," asked Mr. Sims, "bring in the rule just adopted, providing for a vote on this resolution, when a majority of the members of that committee were opposed to the adoption of the resolution, and when they believed that less than the required majority would vote for it? The Rules Committee is a creation of this House and has no powers except those delegated to it by the House, and it exercised the only function or power it had, which was to give its creator the right to act for itself, and it accordingly brought in the rule that made this resolution privileged. Now, this House is the Rules Committee when it comes to amending the Constitution, so far as the States are concerned.

"The States can not vote on this question unless Congress gives them the opportunity, and we are now sitting as a rules committee to say whether or not the States shall have on this proposed amendment the opportunity to accept or reject it. Believing, as I do, that the States will not at this time by three-fourths majority vote for or adopt this amendment, yet, like the Rules Committee, I shall vote to submit it to the States, who alone can determine for themselves in a constitutional way whether or not this amendment should be adopted. We have no more right to withhold from the States the privilege that is given them by the Constitution than the Rules Committee has to withhold from this House an opportunity to exercise the power vested in the House. The Rules Committee possesses nothing but delegated powers. We, as Members of this House, have nothing but delegated powers. It makes no difference to you how I shall vote in Tennessee should this question be submitted to a vote in that State, and in discharging my duty here it makes no difference to me how Tennessee will vote. I am willing to trust the wisdom of the States in the exercise of their reserved powers."

MR. SELDOMRIDGE, of Colorado, a Democrat, in the course of an extended speech also endeavored to refute this argument.

"We expect to hear in this discussion that this amendment violates the rights of the States," he said, "but there can be no violation of any State right when each State has recognized the right of three-fourths of the States to amend the National Constitution and make such amendment binding upon all the States.

"To discuss the merits of the State-rights theory in the light of the experiences and judgment of the past 50 years is in every sense futile and unnecessary. The question was decided through the arbitrament of war, and that clear verdict will never be reversed except through constitutional methods."

This completed the speeches by the Democrats in answer to the State rights argument.

On the Republican side of the House the refutation of this doctrine was taken up by Mr. Mann, of Illinois, floor leader of the Republicans, and Mr. Campbell, of Kansas.

Mr. Mann's argument was similar to that of Mr. Sims.

"The Committee on Rules supported by a vote of the House," said Mr. Mann, "has thought it wise to submit to this body the pending resolution in order that this body may express itself upon that resolution. The same reasoning ought to cause this body to pass the question on to the States, because submitting it here were an idle ceremony. No vote that we take here settles it as a part of the Constitution, and if there was reason for the Committee on Rules to bring the matter before the House and for the House to take it under consideration, then there is that stronger reason for letting the only bodies which can determine it determine it in the constitutional method."

MR. CAMPBELL'S remarks dealt mainly with the responsibility of the Demacratic Party for fostering the State rights opposition to the amendment.

Said Mr. Campbell:

"The President and many of his followers insist that granting the right of suffrage to women is one that must be dealt with by the States. He invokes the doctrine of State sovereignty with the same enthusiasm and confidence that others of his party invoked that doctrine in favor of human slavery in other days. The doctrine of State rights would be a better shield to use against woman's suffrage if it were also invoked against Federal authority in preventing the spread of yellow fever and the ravages of the boll weevil in Southern States and the establishment of employment agencies in the industrial centers of the North, where there are today so many jobless men.

"Why, within the few weeks last passed the gentleman from Texas has made these walls echo with his eloquence in support of a proposition requiring the Federal Government to finance the cotton planters of Texas, taking the place of local Texas banks.

* * * * * *

"The laws relative to the franchise and voting should be the same in all our country. Experience and conditions incident to the matter of establishing qualifications for voting argue for the same law for all parts of the country and for one law instead of 48 to accomplish the same general purpose. State lines have been yielding to the demands for government from Washington more and more in recent years. The selection and maintenance, therefore, of the Government at Washington, as a matter of right, should be under franchise and election laws enacted in Washington. To say the least, the opportunty should be given to amend the Constitution in this important particular, if the people of the States see fit to make the change. And the President, as the leader of his party, when he charges the opposition with not having a new idea in 30 years, should at least find some buffer for everything new that is proposed besides the doctrine of State sovereignty that surrendered at Appomattox half a century ago."

THE Progressive membership of the House was represented on this point by Mr. McDonald, of Michigan.

"Another stock argument," said Mr. McDonald, "that is made here is that this is an unconstitutional way of providing equal suffrage. The Constitution provides that this is exactly the way in which the Constitution may be amended, and it sounds strange to my ears that any Member of Congress should stand up here and say that the National Government is settling anything when the Congress votes to submit this question to the people as provided by the Constitution. The National Government is not, and Congress is not, endeavoring or attempting to settle anything. Congress is doing what they have always admitted they ought to do. They are submitting to the sovereign States of the Union for amendment of the Constitution a provision that an overwhelming mass of citizens have petitioned for. That is the issue. Aside from the merits of the suffrage question, that is the issue that confronts the Member of Congress who casts his vote today, whether he is willing to submit a constitutional amendment to be adopted according to the provosions of the Constitution when an overwhelming mass of the citizenship of the country petition for that submission."

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

State Rights in the Prohibition Debate

THE point on which the enemies of suffrage placed the greatest reliance in opposing the national amendment in the House debate was that of state rights. In this connection it is interesting to note the arguments adduced against states' rights by seven Southern Democrats in supporting the prohibition amendment. These gentlemen in their ardent support of national prohibition argued the state rights theory practically out of existence. Why then did this doctrine suddenly loom so large in the eyes of these same Southern gentlemen less than a month later when suffrage instead of prohibition was the topic under consideration?

We quote below the utterances in the prohibition debate by the seven Southern Democrats, each of whom opposed the suffrage amendment.

Mr. Stephens, of Mississippi, (Democrat).

I AM not unmindful of the many arguments earnestly indulged in by those opposing the resolution, chief among which is the time-worn doctrine of the rights of the States. This argument has been answered very ably, and I shall not take any time in discussing it further than to say that, in my judgment, it is unsound. It may be that as a disciple of Alexander Hamilton I am too much of a Federalist. However, the sacredness of State lines is growing less and less potent with me as the years pass. The fiction that we are 48 different people finds no lodgment in my mind. Our rivers cross State lines as they go murmuring on their way to the sea; our mountain ranges link together the different States; our railroad, telephone, and telegraph lines cement the different Commonwealths together as one great country. In fact, we are one people with one language. Our hopes and aims are one. All that would benefit or injure any part of the country indirectly benefits or injures the whole. That the liquor traffic is national in its bearing seems to me requires no argument. And in my humble judgment the man who takes the position that it is a question for the States alone to settle will find his position hopelessly weak and his arguments, when scrutinized under the searching light of public opinion, will be scattered like "autumn leaves before a winter wind." * * * * * *

Even though an amendment shall have the effect of depriving a State of some right that it now possesses, the State has no ground of complaint, and there is no infringement of the doctrine of State rights, if such amendment is adopted in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. There is a wide and well defined distinction between an invasion of the rights of the States and a delegation of further power to the National Government by the States.

No one will contend that the States are unable to delegate further powers to the general government. The very fact that provision is made for amendment would settle the proposition if it was brought in question. That it is unnecessary to obtain the consent of every State to amend the Constitution is also settled by the provision for amendment, for it requires the consent of three-fourths only. The only exception is in regard to representation in the Senate, which is "that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that this is not an invasion of State rights. Three-fourths of the States are given the right to amend the Constitution, and it is a denial of a Constitutional right granted that number of States, if we assert that an amendment shall not be made to the Constitution because some State opposes the amendment. The doctrine of State rights is not involved here, though the question of expediency might be a legitimate subject for discussion when the issue is presented in the States. Each State must settle it for itself, subject only to the right of three-fourths of the States to ratify the proposed amendment.

(Mr. Stephens then quotes at length from John C. Calhoun to support his position.)

Mr. Quin, of Mississippi, (Democrat).

I BELIEVE in the doctrine of States rights. I represent a district where Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, was reared. My father went out and fought for States rights. But we are not living in the past; we are living for today and for the future. We cannot bring up the traditions of the past to govern the country of today.

Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, (Democrat).

IN my humble judgment there is no better way to have government of the people than to have it by the people. That is all which the proposed amendment to the Constitution seeks to accomplish.

Mr. Saunders, of Virginia, (Democrat).

HOW then can this resolution be critically assailed as an invasion in any sense of States rights when it is a proceeding under the Constitution, by virtue of the Constitution, and in conformity with the Constitution to amend the Constitution, conformably to a reserved right contained in that very instrument? * * * * *

Our Constitution is not a fetish nor a fossil. It must keep step and be in touch with popular sentiment. * * * * * * * * *

The Constitution and the spirit of the age must be one.

Mr. Howard, of Georgia, (Democrat).

IF the resolution is adopted it will leave it up to the people. * * * Are we, as representatives of American people, so cowardly as to refuse to submit the question to them that they may through their regularly elected legislatures express the will of a majority as to this great national problem?

Mr. Garrett, of Texas, (Democrat).

LET me say to my much-disturbed friends, "Let not your souls be thus troubled." There is nothing being done or attempted here out of the ordinary whatever. We are simply proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution, to be submitted to all the States, and to become a law when ratified by a majority of three-fourths of the States of this Union. And let me remind you we are proceeding in exactly the way and manner pointed out by our forefathers, who made and bequeathed to us that much-beloved document. * * * *

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in his devotion to the doctrine of States rights. Sirs, let me remind you that I come from that stock of American ancestry which has ever held sacred and dear that great doctrine. I am the son of a father who offered three of his own precious boys as a living sacrifice upon the altar of his native Southland in defense of the sovereign rights of the Confederate States. My father was a native Virginian, my mother a southern Kentuckian; I was born in old Tennessee and went to the great Empire State of Texas of my own choosing—because I wanted to live in the greatest and biggest State in the Union. I resent the charge that we who favor the submission of this amendment to the States for their adoption or rejection are attempting to surrender to the Federal Government the reserved powers of the States. I am now and have always been a firm believer in the autonomy of the States. I do now and have always opposed Federal interference with the States in the enactment and enforcement of laws for the general welfare of their people. And I here and now challenge the opponents of this resolution to show wherein any State of this Union would be deprived of any right it now has save and except the one right to permit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors.

Mr. Tribble, of Georgia, (Democrat).

MR. SPEAKER, I shall not arbitrarily shut the door on my constituents who should also be granted the privilege of expressing their wishes. * * * If two-thirds of the States desire this amendment, then the one-third should not complain, but the people not agreeing with me would have a right to complain if I should force my personal views on them.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.
SUITS
COATS
J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.
Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York
BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS
WRAPS
FURS

What the Press Says

Suffrage at the Capital

BEFORE the sun sets today the pen of history will jot down an incident which is to be regarded as eventful; which may, when posterity turns back the page, take on proportions of an epoch-maker. Woman suffrage will come to a vote in the House of Representatives.

The Congressional Union has no illusions respecting the result of the vote. To secure a show of hands in the Federal parliament is no small accomplishment. Nor does it matter that a considerable number—probably the greater number—of workers in and for the cause have not participated in the effort which has won this triumph. Many, indeed, have sought to discourage it as a wasteful expenditure of party funds and energy.

The point is that the women who undertook the siege of the White House have won. They have pried their Constitutional amendment out of committee and on to the floor, and they get a roll-call. That is what the President meant when he complimented these women on their "tenacity." They do not believe as he does, nor as other suffragists do, that the campaign should be confined to the states individually. But the virtue of tenacity commands impartial applause.

On the occasion of the glad gathering of the Congressional legions in Washington Sunday night, Miss Joy Webster, the treasurer, reported that thirty-seven thousand dollars had been expended to induce the House to bring the matter to a vote; legitimately expended of course—there is no resemblance to an insidious lobby in the methods of your ardent suffragist;—she goes at it right out loud, so that everybody shall hearken, even if everybody does not heed. The women, perhaps, have not got a bargain. But—again—they have got what they set out for.—*The Providence* (R. I.) *Journal,* January 12.

The Democrats and States' Rights

THE other day the country heard from President Wilson that the Republican Party had not advanced a new idea for thirty years. But now a Democratic President goes back to ante-bellum days, and revives the morbid doctrine of states' rights to meet the woman suffrage issue.

"It is a question for the states," says President Wilson. Ditto, Mr. Bryan. Ditto, Leader Underwood. Ditto, the Democratic majority.

But slavery was not settled by the states, nor nullification, nor squatter sovereignty. The Nation overrode the states, or some of them, and forever exploded the good old Democratic principle that the United States is merely a bunch of units, and not a great sovereign entity.

The President is merely trying to fool the women. So is Congress. It can't be done.—*The Morning Oregonian,* Portland, Oregon, January 13.

Franchise for Women

IT is significant therefore that without the support and despite the express disapproval of the measure by Mr. Wilson the proposed amendment to the Constitution came but thirty votes short of an actual majority in the House. While the failure to muster an actual majority was depressing to the women who had fought the issue with indomitable energy—they did not expect to gain a two-thirds favorable vote—they have made a showing that removes from all controversy the national character of the issue. Seldom in the history of the nation has a cause advanced as rapidly as has that for the enfranchisement of women.—*Baltimore American,* January 14.

Democratic Opposition

IF a woman suffrage amendment succeeded in being ratified by three-quarters of the states, only a purblind theorist could wish to set aside the will of such an overwhelming majority because of a possible opposition among the remaining quarter of the Union. Yet we learn from the House debate on equal suffrage last Tuesday that most of the anti-suffrage Democrats represent themselves as precisely such fanatics. In spite of Mr. Underwood's sententious talk, and in spite of the well-known reputation of Democratic Congressmen for cold intellectual honesty, it is hard to stomach this employment of the argument of state rights in relation to a question so founded on ordinary human requirements as franchise. * * * The quality of the opposition to woman suffrage is exposed. The temper of those Democrats who compliment suffragists on their "tenacity and skill and address" has been marked for political digestion. The majority that voted down equal suffrage have served, by the very virtue of the voting process, to give reality to a contention hitherto vague, and thus to bring women nearer the vote.—*The New Republic,* Jan. 16.

Equal Suffrage and Congress

CONSIDERING all factors of the situation, and recalling the insignificant proportions of the "cause" as a national problem no longer than a decade ago, at least so far as Congress was concerned, the size of the vote polled for the amendment was remarkable. The change is due partly to the strategy of suffragists who have made Washington a permanent center of agitation and an annual rallying point for women whose characters and careers count when they appear as champions, and also to the presence in Congress itself of such an increased number of Representatives and Senators who have voting women as their constituents. Doctrinaire, theoretical opposition counts for less than it used to, when brought squarely up against the experience of lawmakers who have personal knowledge of what woman does as an elector. The testimony of such witnesses tends to overcome opposition among lawmakers from states without equal suffrage, for it usually is on the side of full democracy and against discrimination as between men and women.—*Christian Science Monitor,* Jan. 15.

The Woman Suffrage Vote in the House

IT is politic, no doubt, to continue the agitation in the national field. Campaigns like that made in the House of Representatives clarify the situation and show just where the opposition to the suffrage movement is strongest. They put politicians on record and help to make votes for women an issue with which national parties must deal. It was a considerable accomplishment to poll 174 votes in the popular branch of Congress for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution. That was a demonstration well worth while as a piece of political strategy.—*New York Tribune,* January 13, 1915.

The States' Rights Argument

THERE can be nothing but contempt and disgust at the show which Congressmen made of themselves in hopping like marionettes to put their votes where they thought they would do most good, and it is shocking that important political leaders should endeavor to make party capital out of an essentially non-partisan subject.

And after all, there is an element of humor in the Democratic anxiety for this particular phase of state rights, while continuously and brazenly helping to trample on almost every other form of state rights, and state equities.

Entrusted with the trusteeship of the national domain, the Democrats abuse that trust to exclude the sovereignity of the states from great areas of their territory, usurp control of great functions which they explicitly recognize as within the purview of state authority and sequester revenues which in all equity should be within the disposal of the states.

Whenever the National Government employs any legitimate Federal power—whether it be the control of the postoffice, inter-state commerce, foreign relations, or whatever it may be—to in the slightest degree interfere with the free exercise of their police powers by the states, it commits an act of usurpation whose consequences, some time in the future, may be deplorable.

It would be well if this Democratic Administration and Congress would display the same zeal for the safe-guarding of all the rights of the states that is shown in their sturdy resistance on the state control of suffrage.—*The San Francisco Chronicle,* January 14.

Mr. Henry in the Suffrage Debate

CONGRESSMAN HENRY'S remark is particularly gratifying: "I shall support the rule because I believe a vote should be given on any proposal which has become a national issue." This indicates that a change of heart is taking place among the leaders of the Democratic Party. Maryland suffragists will remember that only a few months ago Mr. Henry told a delegation from this State that suffrage was not a question of national importance.—*Maryland Suffrage News,* Saturday, January 16, 1915.

Over Half of the People in Washington
EAT CORBY'S BREAD--WHY?

Treasurer's Report

MISS LAVINIA DOCK, vice chairman of the Woman Suffrage Party of New York City, writes: "I think the result in Congress was exceedingly gratifying—better than I had expected. I feel it is very greatly the result of your wonderful 'pace setting' and vigorous, fresh work." The remarkable vote obtained in the House—the first time that the matter has ever been brought to a vote in that body—fills us with confidence that the final success of the Federal Amendment is near at hand.

Will you not help us to continue the work which has already achieved such a large measure of success?

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD $100,000 FUND FOR SECURING THE PASSAGE OF THE FEDERAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

(Fund opened December 7th, 1912. Donations, membership fees and tickets are here listed; receipts from the purely business departments of "The Suffragist" and the Literature Committee are not included.)

LIST OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM JANUARY 5, 1915, THROUGH JANUARY 11, 1915

Mrs. Elsa Connor	$10.00
Mrs. Laura R. Church	10.00
Mrs. Rose Kennett	1.00
Miss Gloria Fechner	1.00
Mrs. Kate Boeckh (Collected)	1.15
Miss Alberta Hill	2.00
Dr. Frances Van Gasken	1.00
Mrs. C. A. Fant	1.00
Miss Lydia Cherot	2.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Owens	.10
Mrs. Ida M. Waters	.50
Miss Caroline I. Reily	10.00
Mrs. Juliet Barrett Rublee	1.00
A Friend	10.00
Miss Joy L. Webster	5.00
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith	25.00
Mrs. Bertha A. Mulhall	1.00
Mrs. Thompson-Seton	10.00
Mrs. Frederic P. Gibson	3.00
National Association of Democratic Women of America (per Mrs. Henry Churchill Cook)	9.00
Mrs. Amy W. Hotchkiss	1.00
Mrs. Charles Erp	1.00
Mrs. E. A. Maxey	1.00
Mrs. Vesta Kenney	1.00
Mrs. Summerfield Baldwin	1.00
Mrs. Edna S. Latimer	1.00
Mrs. Edna S. Latimer (Collected)	1.00
Miss M. Soper	.50
Miss Eleanor Lawson	.50
Anonymous	1.00
Miss Mildred Koonce	.75
Miss Charlotte Johnston	.50
Mrs. Almira Sweeton	3.00
Mrs. Ellis Logan	.25
Mrs. Anna Harmon	.25
Miss Julia Hurlbut	.25
Mrs. Wager-Smith	.25
Mrs. E. Baird Chenoweth	.25
Mrs. A. S. Bowman	.25
Mrs. John P. Dunlop	1.00
Miss Gertrude Lukens	.50
Mr. John Pries	5.00
Mrs. Richard Gardner	1.00
Miss Bertha Trail	1.00
Mrs. Mary R. Bancroft	25.00
Mrs. Victor du Pont	10.00
Miss Katherine Masters	1.00
Mrs. E. L. Haynes	5.00
Mrs. W. K. du Pont	25.00
Mrs. Benjamin Nields	10.00
Dr. De Lacour	1.00
Dr. Pusey Heald	4.00
Mrs. Harry Yerger	5.00
Delaware Equal Suffrage Association	10.00
Miss Marguerite Wallace	.50
Miss Mary Conkle	.50
Miss Nellie Forrest	1.00
Mrs. Naomi Schropper	2.00
Mrs. Henry Justice	25.00
Miss Flannery	5.00
Mrs. Charlotte L. Pierce	2.00
Miss Anne Heygate Hall	5.00
Miss Mary W. Lippincott	5.00
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley	5.00
Anonymous	10.00
Mrs. C. M. Brooke	1.00
Miss Caroline Hoffman	1.00
Mrs. G. Harvey Clark	1.00
"C. S."	.26
Mrs. Gertrude Mackenzie	.14
Miss Emily K. Perry	.50
Miss L. T. Middleton	.50
Miss Helen Todd	5.00
A Friend	1.50
Mrs. E. Dana Durand	8.00
Miss Viola Thorwarth	1.00
Mrs. Marie Manning Gasch	5.00
Miss Marion W. Graves	5.00
Miss Helen Lippincott	5.00
Collections	50.70
Membership fees	12.50
Total	$382.10
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	$52,593.66
Total through January 10, 1915	$52,975.76

1000 New Subscribers

THE subscription list of *The Suffragist* is growing rapidly, and subscribers are showing more and more interest in the work of the Congressional Union as a result. In sending in a contribution for the work of the Union, Mrs. Amy Warner Hotchkiss, Secretary and Organizer for the Woman's Political Union of Bronx County, New York, says: *"The Suffragist* is a constant delight to me. I really do not see how I could possibly keep in touch with the congressional work without it."

Will not every reader who believes that a knowledge of congressional work is essential to all persons engaged in suffrage activities, do all in her power to increase the number who are being reached by this paper?

Members Who Have Secured New Subscribers

JANUARY 5th TO JANUARY 20th, 1915

Mrs. Ida May Waters	1
Miss Virginia J. Arnold	1
Miss Frances Frothingham	1
Miss M. Brooke Bright	1
Miss Joy Young	1
Mrs. Abbie Scott Baker	1
Miss Doris Stevens	2
Miss Anne Dabney	1
Miss Mabel Vernon	2
Mrs. Julia S. Lucky	1
Miss Gertrude L Crocker	1
Mrs. J. S. Mendenhall	1
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr	1
Miss Marie Goucher Greene	1
Miss Julia Goldsborough	2
Miss Doris Stevens	2
Miss Margaret Fay Whittemore	3
Miss Emily K. Perry	1
	24
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	501
Total to January 20th	525

The Advisory Council

MRS. THOMAS F. WALSH, of Washington, D. C., and Mrs. Edward N. Breitung, of New York City, have, during the past week, joined the Advisory Council of the Congressional Union.

Mrs. Walsh and Mrs. Breitung are both close personal friends of Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, of New York, who is a member of the Executive Committee of the Union, and it is through her that they have become actively interested in the work for the Susan B. Anthony amendment. Both of them are brilliant women of culture and ability with a wide executive experience in social and philanthropic work, and their active interest and participation in suffrage is welcomed heartily by all suffragists.

The New Freedom

—in printing is getting away from the "long line, short line" old-timey style of composition and using modern display—the effective kind. *"We Grow 'Cause We Know."* Main 4-2-5-0

COLUMBIAN PRINTING CO., Inc.
815 Fourteenth St. N. W.

Telephone Main 673

Lanman Engraving Co.

HALF TONES, ZINC ETCHINGS
PROCESS ENGRAVERS

POST BUILDING Washington, D. C.

Meyer's Military Shops
1327 F STREET NORTHWEST
Laces, Braids, Fringes, Cords, Gold, Antique Silver
We WILL Match YOUR MATERIAL
"Visit Our Show Shop"

Phone Main 8384 **Toilet Articles**

GERTRUDE CLEMENS
Expert Shampooing and Hairdressing
Room 232 Oxford Building, 726 14th Street N.W.
Manicuring—Hair Work Facial and Scalp Treatment
Open Evenings Until Seven

"THE BUSY CORNER"
S. Kann Sons & Co.
8TH ST. AND PENNA. AVE.

OPEN 9:00 A. M.—CLOSE 5:45 P. M.

JET! JET! JET!
YET AGAIN
Gleaming and Fascinating
DRESS TRIMMINGS

It has a wonderful vogue—the use of sparkling jet ornaments and garnitures. There are many new things including:

Ornaments, Tassels, Festoon Effects, Pendants, Chain Effects, Cascade Effects, Spangles, Cabochons, Sequins Garnitures

The designs are quite new and mostly to be found ONLY at KANNS'.

Prices range from 15c a yard to $5.95 for the all-overs and flouncings. Tassels from 10c to $1.69 each.

Trimming Store—Street Floor